

Serial No. 09/709,830

- 10 -

Art Unit: 2142

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated December 7, 2005. All rejections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

At paragraphs 1-18 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-44 as being anticipated by United States Patent number 6,081,513 of Roy ("Roy"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Roy discloses a method for providing real-time multimedia conferencing services over a hybrid network. Architectural entities within a multimedia bridge of the Roy system execute a multimedia performance and resource analysis algorithm, and determine whether the network and the bridge have sufficient resources to satisfy the requirements of a requested multimedia conference call. Signaling information messages are exchanged between the communicating entities of Roy indicating whether the multimedia conference can be accepted, rejected, or accepted to operate in degraded mode, based on the analysis performed by the bridge. See Abstract.

Fig. 1 of Roy specifically shows a number of conventional routers for transferring signals, which may each be equipped with an ATM interface, and which preferably have traffic monitoring capability for the respective LAN hubs to which they are connected. See column 3, lines 14-29 of Roy. In column 6, at lines 54-65, Roy describes a call set up scenario between communicating entities via the multipoint multimedia bridge (MMB). Fig. 5 of Roy shows a calling computer sending an admission request (ARQ) message to the multipoint multimedia bridge (MMB) requesting a conference call between computers/workstations. The calling

Serial No. 09/709,830

- 11 -

Art Unit: 2142

computer of Fig. 5 in Roy also sends information regarding bandwidth and quality of service requirements for the conference call to the MMB. After the ARQ message is received, the MMB checks addresses of the calling computer, ATM addresses of the called computers, quality of service requirements for the conference call, type of services to be provided for all resources that belong to different service levels, end-to-end delay requirements for all media, cell/packet loss tolerances, bandwidth requirements, preferences for communication, and the criteria for acceptance of the conference call (fully met requirements, partially met requirements that can be termed to operate in degraded mode, or requirements are not met that will force rejection of the call)).

Step 9 in Fig. 5 of Roy determines whether there is sufficient network and bridge resources to (1) provide a call that satisfies all requirements of the conference call, (2) provide a call in which some requirements can be partially met while the others are fully met, qualifying the conference call to operate in "degraded mode", or (3) provide an indication that the call has been rejected due to the unavailability of critical resources. In step 12 of Fig. 5 of Roy, the ACF (admission for conference call confirmed), DCF (admission for conference call degraded mode confirmed), or ARJ (admission for conference call rejected) message is sent to the bridge service manager and the multimedia bridge resource manager depending on the decision made in step 9.

Nowhere in Roy is there disclosed or suggested any method or system for performing a service on a network device, that includes:

loading the service on the network device from another location, the service having a corresponding set of service relationships, *wherein the loading includes downloading a file corresponding to the service and containing program code operable to perform the service;*
... (emphasis added)

Serial No. 09/709,830

- 12 -

Art Unit: 2142

as in the present independent claim 1. Independent claims 18, 35, 43 and 44 include analogous limitations. In contrast, and as indicated above, Roy describes setting up a conference call in which a conference call request message (the "ARQ" message) sent from a calling computer system causes a multimedia bridge (the "MMB") to perform a resource analysis step to determine whether the requested call can be accepted (step 9 of Fig. 5). Based on this resource analysis, the Roy system may reserve resources needed to accept the call request (step 13 of Fig. 5), and determine what type of message ("ACF", "DCF", or "ARJ") is sent back to the calling computer system from the bridge (step 13 of Fig. 5), indicating whether the call was accepted, accepted in degraded mode, or rejected. Nothing in the call setup scenario described in Roy provides any teaching or suggestion of loading a service on a network device from another location, the service having a corresponding set of service relationships, *wherein the loading includes downloading a file corresponding to the service and containing program code operable to perform the service*, as in the present independent claims 1, 18, 35, 43 and 44.

The other teachings of Roy cited by the Examiner are similarly lacking in this regard. In particular, Applicants note that the traffic monitoring by an ATM interface disclosed in lines 14-30 of column 3 of Roy includes no teaching or suggestion of the above indicated limitation of the independent claims.

Applicants also respectfully disagree that lines 14-34 of column 4 in Roy teach what could reasonably be considered an "application server that stores a plurality of services", as stated by the Examiner in paragraph 12 of the Office Action. This section of Roy describes components within a communication protocol stack in Fig. 2 that permit end to end communication between the computer system and bridge of Fig. 1 of Roy. As the service of Roy

Serial No. 09/709,830

- 13 -

Art Unit: 2142

is a real-time multimedia conference provided between two computer systems, no "server that stores a plurality of services" is present in the communication protocol stack of Fig. 2 in Roy. Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Roy, including the resource analysis performed in order to process a conference call request message, the traffic monitoring by an ATM interface, the communication protocol stack of Fig. 2, and/or the teachings of the other sections cited by the Examiner, disclose or suggest a method or system for performing a service on a network device that involves *downloading a file corresponding to the service and containing program code operable to perform the service*, as in the present independent claims 1, 18, 35, 43 and 44.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully urge that Roy does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims 1, 18, 35 and 44. Accordingly, Roy does not anticipate the present independent claims 1, 18, 35 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 102. As to claims 2-4, 6-14 and 19-42, they each depend from claims 1, 18 and 35, and are believed to be patentable over Roy for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that all rejections of the Examiner be withdrawn. All claims are believed to be allowable, and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/709,830

- 14 -

Art Unit: 2142

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone David A. Dagg, Applicants' Attorney at 617-630-1131 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

MARCH 7 2006
Date

David A. Dagg
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park Drive
Acton, MA 01720
(617) 630-1131

Docket No. 0270157 120-077